

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

LIMOLINER, INC.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	NO. 05-11888
)	
SETRA OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
SETRA OF NORTH AMERICA, INC.,)	
Third-Party Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
UPSTATE TOURS, INC. and UPSTATE)	
TRANSIT, INC.,)	
Third-Party Defendants.)	

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO UPSTATE TRANSIT, INC.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS**

CAMPBELL, CAMPBELL, EDWARDS &
CONROY, P.C.
James M. Campbell
Kiley M. Belliveau
One Constitution Plaza
Third Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 241-3000

CREMER, KOPON, SHAUGHNESSY & SPINA,
LLC
William J. Cremer
Thomas R. Pender
Attorneys for Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff
Setra of North America, Inc.
180 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 726-3800

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	3
POINT I	
UPSTATE IS SUBJECT TO THE GENERAL JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT	3
A. The Massachusetts Long-Arm Statute Authorizes Jurisdiction	4
B. UPSTATE Has Sufficient Minimum Contacts with Massachusetts and Derives Revenue From the Services It Provides in Massachusetts To Be Subject to General Jurisdiction	4
POINT II	
UPSTATE IS SUBJECT TO THE SPECIFIC JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT	6
A. SETRA’S Claims Against UPSTATE Relate to UPSTATE’S Forum-Related Activities	6
B. UPSTATE’S Minimum Contacts with Massachusetts Represent a Purposeful Availment of the Privilege of Conducting Activities In Massachusetts	7
POINT III	
EXERCISING JURISDICTION OVER UPSTATE DOES NOT OFFEND DUE PROCESS	10
A. Exercising Jurisdiction Over UPSTATE Is Reasonable	10
B. The Balance of the “Gestalt Factors” Favors Exercising Jurisdiction Over UPSTATE	11
1. The Defendant’s Burden of Appearing	11

2.	The Forum State’s Interest in Adjudicating the Dispute	12
3.	The Plaintiff’s Interest in Obtaining Convenient and Effective Relief	13
4.	The Judicial System’s Interest in Obtaining the Most Effective Resolution of the Controversy	14
5.	The Common Interests of All Sovereigns in Promoting Substantive Social Policies	15
CONCLUSION		15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>State Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>City of Boston v. Smith & Wesson Corp.</i> , 2000 WL 34018326, No. 99-02590 (Mass. Super. Nov. 21, 2000)	5
<i>Papa Gino's, Inc. v. Baystate Bagel's, Inc.</i> , 2001 WL 716881, No. CA0003708 (Mass. Super. May 11, 2001)	7-8
<i>Sonesta International Hotels Corp. v. Central Florida Investments, Inc.</i> , 47 Mass. App. Ct. 154 (1999)	8
<i>Tatro v. Manor Care, Inc.</i> , 416 Mass. 763 (1994)	7
<u>Federal Cases</u>	
<i>Hanson v. Denckla</i> , 357 U.S. 235, 253 (1958)	3
<i>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> , 326 U.S. 310 (1945)	3
<i>Keds Corp. v. Renee Int'l Trading Corp.</i> , 888 F.2d 215 (1st Cir. 1989)	5
<i>Kolikof v. Samuelson</i> , 488 F. Supp. 881 (D. Mass. 1980)	5
<i>Mark v. Obear and Sons, Inc.</i> , 313 F. Supp. 373 (D. Mass. 1970)	5
<i>Noonan v. The Winston Co.</i> , 135 F.3d 85 (1st Cir. 1998)	3, 6, 10-11
<i>Nowak v. Tak How Investments, Ltd.</i> , 94 F.3d 708 (1st Cir. 1996)	12, 14
<i>Pritzker v. Yari</i> , 42 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 1994)	11, 14
<i>United Elec. Workers v. 163 Pleasant Street Corp.</i> , 960 F.2d 1080 (1st Cir. 1992)	3, 6, 7
<i>Wolverine Proctor & Schwarz, Inc. v. Aeroglide Corp.</i> , 394 F. Supp. 2d 299 (D. Mass. 2005)	11, 13, 15
<i>Workgroup Technology Corp. v. MGM Grand Hotel, LLC</i> , 246 F. Supp. 2d 102 (D. Mass. 2003)	11-13
<i>World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson</i> , 444 U.S. 286 (1980)	4
<i>Yankee Group, Inc. v. Yamashita</i> , 678 F. Supp. 20 (D. Mass. 1988)	14

Massachusetts General Laws

M.G.L. 223A, § 3(a)	6
M.G.L. 223A, § 3(d)	4